Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/587,196	KONO, YOSHIYUKI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Margaret G. Moore	1796		

	Margaret G. Moore	1796		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 02 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (i) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extraction date of the structure of	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	,,		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.		
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).			
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	•	•	_	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1 to 23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	· —	l be entered and an ex	xplanation of	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a	
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but of reasons noted in the attached paper.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:	
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
13.				
	/Margaret G. Moore/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1796		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment raises new issues in that it would raise a new ground of rejection for claim 19, which would depend upon a cancelled claim.